

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-21 and 23-31 are pending in the application. Claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 are allowed. Claims 4-13 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Winters (U.S. 6,466,960). Claims 1-3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Winters (U.S. 6,466,960) in view of Wickman et al. (U.S. 6,952,297). Claims 16-19 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 25 are amended.

First, Applicants would like to gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication claims 20-24 are allowed and claims 16-19 contain allowable subject matter. *See* Office Action dated 5/11/2007, paragraphs 7 & 8. In this response, claim 16 is rewritten in independent form (including base and intervening claims) as claim 32. New claims 33-35 depend from allowable claim 32, and therefore are allowable as well.

Applicants respectfully submit the cited references do not teach or suggest at least an apparatus comprising a fifth transistor with a drain connected to a second output and a source connected to the drain of a fourth transistor (*e.g.*, as described in claim 10).

The Office Action asserts Winters teaches a fifth transistor (citing transistor BH 25 in Figure 3A) with a drain connected to the second output and a source connected to the drain of a fourth transistor (citing transistor AH 25 in Figure 3A). It further asserts Figure 3A of Winters is the same as Figure 1 of the present application. *See* Office Action dated 5/11/2007, page 5. Applicants disagree. The source of cited fifth transistor BH 25 is connected to the *source* of cited fourth transistor AH 25, not its drain.

Both claim 10 and Figure 1 of the present application describe a fifth transistor with a drain connected to a second output and a source connected to the *drain* of a fourth transistor. Therefore, the Office Action's regarding Figure 1 is incorrect, and the current rejection fails to

teach or suggest each and every limitation as claimed. The Winters reference fails to teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 10 and therefore the current rejection should be withdrawn. Applicants submit independent claim 10 is allowable, and independent claims 20 and 25 are allowable for similar reasons. Claims 11-15, 21, 23-24 and 26-31 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

Applicants further submit the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least an apparatus comprising a symmetric differential domino carry generate circuit having true inputs with a first load and compliment inputs with a second load, wherein the load for the true inputs is equal to the load for the compliment inputs (*e.g.*, as described in amended claim 1).

First, Applicants agree with the Office Action's assertion Winters does not explicitly define or illustrate at least an embodiment as described in claim 1 wherein the load for true inputs is equal to the load for the compliment inputs. *See* Office Action dated 5/11/2007, page 9. To make up for the deficiencies of Winters, the Office Action asserts Wickman teaches the relevant limitations, citing column 3, lines 7-14 and column 4, lines 42-45. Applicants disagree.

Applicants submit column 3, lines 7-14 and column 4, lines 42-45 describe Figure 2 of Winters. Figure 2 of Winters describes a circuit with a single load with a combined resistance of R_1 and R_2 . *See* column 2, lines 61-65 ("In the diagram of FIG. 2, a resistance of the driver circuit 36 may be substantially equal to the combined resistance values of R_1 and R_2 . R_1 may represent a resistance of the photoemitter 34. As may be noted, a ground potential exists between R_1 and R_2 "). However, claim 1 describes, among other things, an embodiment circuit having true inputs with a first load and compliment inputs with a second load. Figure 2 of Winters (including its description in cited column 3, lines 7-14 and column 4, lines 42-45) fail to teach or suggest at least these limitations. Therefore, the current rejection is lacking and should

be withdrawn. Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable, and claims 2-9 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: November 13, 2007

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501